

Magnetic Phase Diagram of the Ferromagnetically Stacked Triangular Ising Antiferromagnet

M.L. Plumer

*Centre de Recherche en Physique du Solide et Département de Physique
Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Québec, Canada J1K 2R1*

A. Mailhot

*INRS-EAU, 2800 rue Einstein, C.P. 7500, Ste.-Foy, Québec, Canada G1V 4C7
(November 1994)*

Histogram Monte-Carlo simulation results are presented for the magnetic-field – temperature phase diagram of the Ising model on a stacked triangular lattice with antiferromagnetic intraplane and ferromagnetic interplane interactions. Finite-size scaling results for this frustrated system at three points along the paramagnetic transition boundary are presented which strongly suggest a line of tricritical points at low field and a first-order transition line at higher fields. These results are compared with the corresponding phase diagrams from conventional mean-field theory as well as from the Monte Carlo mean-field calculations of Netz and Berker [Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 377 (1991)].

75.40.Mg, 75.40.Cx, 75.10.Hk

I. INTRODUCTION

Despite being perhaps the simplest example of a geometrically frustrated magnetic system, and having a long history of investigation,^{1–3} the Ising antiferromagnet on triangular and hexagonal lattices continues to reveal a number of remarkable features⁴ as well as elude consensus regarding some of its critical properties.^{5–9} The additional competition among interactions introduced by a magnetic field often gives rise to a wide variety of multicritical-point phenomena in frustrated systems, with a concomitant change in critical behavior. Although mean-field theories usually can capture at least the qualitative structures of the magnetic phase diagrams as determined by more sophisticated methods, as well as by experiments,³ there are notable exceptions, at least in the case of the *XY* model.^{10,11} In this work, results of extensive Monte Carlo simulations of magnetic-field effects on the stacked triangular Ising model with antiferromagnetic intraplane and ferromagnetic interplane interactions are presented. This study was motivated by the work of Netz and Berker¹² (*NB*) who employed a “Monte-Carlo Mean-Field” theory to investigate the phase diagram. Although this method is essentially based on a mean-field approximation, it preserves the “hard-spin” condition that is believed to be essential for frustrated systems. In view of its relative simplicity, and the continuing controversy regarding the nature

of phase transitions in frustrated antiferromagnets,^{3,13} Monte-Carlo Mean-Field theory is a powerful technique which deserves further testing.

The magnetic ordering process of the frustrated Ising antiferromagnet even at zero field has not been completely resolved. As the temperature is lowered from the paramagnetic (*P*) phase, a transition to a partially disordered period-three state (phase *A*) occurs where one-third of the sublattices remains paramagnetic. Modified mean-field theories predicts that this phase remains stable down to zero temperature.¹⁴ A second peak in the specific heat at lower temperature observed in Monte Carlo (*MC*) results has been interpreted as being associated with a transition to a ferrimagnetic state (phase *B*).⁵ Such a transition also has been indicated in the results of *NB*. Other reports of *MC* simulations,¹⁵ however, suggest that this peak is not associated with a phase transition but signals the onset of new types of excitations associated with the evolution of phase *A* into the zero temperature Wannier state.⁶ Notably, however, a low-temperature phase *B* is stabilized by the addition of next-nearest neighbor interactions, with an intermediate (between phases *A* and *B*) ferrimagnetic phase *C*, as determined by a variety of mean-field approximations^{14,16}, and as recently observed experimentally.¹⁷

Magnetic-field effects have been much less studied. The results of applying a modified mean-field theory to the triangular lattice is a phase diagram which exhibits a small region of phase *A* at low fields, a large region of phase *B* at higher field strengths, and with the Néel temperature being a multicritical point where phases *A*, *B*, and *P* coincide.¹⁸ These results should also apply to the *ferromagnetically* coupled triangular layered system of interest here since mean-field theory is independent of space dimensions. The results of *NB* for the hexagonal system show two transitions at zero field, phase *A* stabilized in a *small* region at lower field values and higher temperatures, phase *B* occupying most of the phase diagram, but with a possibly complex multicritical point occurring at a *finite* field along the paramagnetic phase boundary. An important aspect of these results is the observation that the *P* – *B* phase boundary is a first-order transition line due to the 3-state (Potts) symmetry of phase *B*. The transition at the Néel temperature is believed to be of *XY* universality (due to frustration),^{5,9}

and thus, so should be the entire field-induced transition line $A - P$. *NB* also claim that the $A - B$ transition is continuous. However, we have argued that these two states have the same symmetry so that the transition must be first order.¹⁶ Other work on phase diagrams, of possibly indirect relevance, was based on a phenomenological model for the case of antiferromagnetic interlayer coupling.¹⁶

We study here the Ising Hamiltonian on a simple hexagonal lattice

$$\mathcal{H} = J_{\parallel} \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} S_i S_j + J_{\perp} \sum_{\langle kl \rangle} S_k S_l - H \sum_i S_i \quad (1)$$

where $J_{\parallel} = -1$ is the ferromagnetic interplane interaction, $J_{\perp} = 1$ indicates the antiferromagnetic intraplane coupling which is frustrated for the triangular geometry, $\langle i, j \rangle$ and $\langle k, l \rangle$ represent near-neighbor sums along the hexagonal c axis and in the basal plane, respectively, with an applied field H . After a preliminary examination of the phase diagram based on a simplified molecular-field calculation³ in the next section, the results of finite-size scaling of conventional and histogram¹⁹ MC data are presented. The utility of these approaches in determining phase diagrams of frustrated systems has been previously demonstrated.^{3,11} In contrast with other mean-field models, our calculations yield a phase diagram where only phase B is present, even at zero field. Although the transition at $H = 0$ is continuous, the $P - B$ transition is found to be first-order for all $H \neq 0$. The Néel temperature thus represents a tricritical point within this approximation. Interpretation of the MC data is more difficult due to the ambiguity in making a distinction between phases A and B in the presence of a field, as well as the relatively large effects of critical fluctuations. It is clear, however, that phase A is the only state which occurs at $H = 0$ (in agreement with other MC results and in contrast with *NB*). It is also evident that *if* this state exists at finite fields, it occupies only a very small region of the phase diagram, roughly consistent with the results of *NB*. At high fields, the transition to the paramagnetic state is weakly first-order, in agreement with molecular-field theory and symmetry arguments of *NB*. At lower fields, however, the behavior appears close to tricritical for both of the points on the paramagnetic boundary that were examined. This is in contrast with the prediction of XY universality (*NB*) (as found⁹ at $H = 0$) and suggests the possibility that phase A exists only *at* the paramagnetic boundary for $H \neq 0$.

II. MOLECULAR-FIELD LANDAU THEORY

Analyses of magnetic phase diagrams based on phenomenological Landau-type free energies for frustrated spin systems have proven to be quite successful in reproducing the essential features of both MC and experimental results.³ Usually, qualitative features can be captured

using the more limited approach of deriving such a free energy from a molecular-field treatment of Hamiltonians such as that given by (1). This method allows for the understanding of relative phase stability from analytic expressions and makes symmetry arguments clear. For the present work, the free energy is expanded to sixth order in the spin density

$$s(r) = 2[X \cos(\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{r} + \phi) + Y] \quad (2)$$

where X is the amplitude of the modulated component, Y is a uniform component, and $\mathbf{Q} = 4\pi/(3a)\hat{a}$ is the period-three (in the basal plane) wave vector. Results for the free energy are similar to those of the phenomenological model given in Ref. 16 for the case of antiferromagnetic interlayer coupling, but with a few important differences. In the phenomenological model, the transition temperatures T_x and T_y , as well as the fourth and sixth-order coefficients, B and C , were treated as adjustable parameters. Within the molecular-field derivation, these quantities are determined by

$$T_X = (-2J_{\parallel} + 3J_{\perp})/a, \quad T_Y = -(2J_{\parallel} + 6J_{\perp})/a, \quad (3)$$

along with $B = bT$ and $C = cT$, where the parameters a , b , and c are given in terms of the total angular momentum j .²⁰ For simplicity, we take here $j = 1$ so that, e.g., $a = 3$. In addition, there is a direct Zeeman coupling $-HY$, absent in antiferromagnetic interlayer-coupling case of Ref. 16.

The three phases A , B , and C (labelled 1, 3, and 2, respectively in Ref. 16) are conveniently characterised by Y and the phase angle ϕ : In phase A $Y = 0$, $\phi = (2n + 1)\pi/6$; in phase B $Y \neq 0$, $\phi = n\pi/3$; in phase C $Y \neq 0$, and ϕ takes on intermediate values. Stabilization of the 3-state Potts phase B is due to a term third-order in X , $\sim YX^3 \cos(3\phi)$, and notably involves the uniform component Y , even in the absence of an applied field.¹¹

The resulting phase diagram is shown in Fig. 1. Only phase B occurs, even at zero field. The transition $B - P$ is continuous at $H = 0$ and is first order otherwise. The Néel transition thus represents a tricritical point.

We note that within a corresponding phenomenological model, many different types of phase diagrams can be constructed, including those which feature all three types of ordered phases at zero field. For the purposes of comparison with MC simulation results, only the molecular-field calculation is given here.

III. PHASE DIAGRAM FROM MONTE CARLO SIMULATIONS

Conventional Metropolis MC simulations were performed on the Hamiltonian (1) in an effort to determine the main features of the phase diagram. Periodic boundary conditions were used on $L \times L \times L$ lattices with $L=18-30$. In some cases, a random initial spin configuration

was used and thermodynamic averages were estimated after discarding the first $5 - 10 \times 10^4$ MC steps for thermalization. In most cases, however, the final well thermalized configuration of a previous run was used for the initial spin directions. Averages were then made using $5 - 10 \times 10^5$ MC steps. The paramagnetic phase boundary was estimated by the location of extrema in a variety of thermodynamic functions, discussed in the next section. No such anomalies were observed at the $A - B$ boundary line, which was crudely estimated at finite field by the calculated value of the phase angle ϕ .²¹ At $H = 0$, a well-defined signature of phase A is the absence of the uniform component Y . This quantity was found to extrapolate to zero at large L for all temperatures examined ($T > 0.4$) and no signature of a transition ($T \sim 0.9$) to a low- T phase B , as found in Ref. 5, was observed.

The phase angle ϕ is not in general well defined since a multitude of values are energetically equivalent, e.g., $\phi = \pi/6, \pi/2, \dots$ in phase A . MC results at $H = 0$ indicated that an average over these values ($\langle \phi \rangle = \pi/4$) was produced, suggesting a small energy barrier between these states. At finite field, however, a transition region (dependent on L and the number of MC steps used) from this averaged state to one with stabilized values of $\phi = n\pi/3$ was observed. We tentatively associate this observation with a possible $A - B$ transition. Energy barriers between the degenerate states of phase B are likely higher due to the presence of the cubic Potts term discussed above and it thus appears that a particular phase angle is selected for a given MC run. Using MC data at $L = 21$, a region of possible stability for phase A determined in this way is indicated in Fig. 2. Note that the Y is always non-zero in the presence of a field due to the Zeeman interaction and thus is not a good indicator of an $A - B$ transition.

Although there is general agreement (except at $H = 0$) between the results of Fig. 2 and those of NB , the existence of a finite region of the ordered state A in the phase diagram is suspect. We base this comment on the conspicuous absence of any anomalies in the thermodynamic functions, as well as the finite-size results for critical exponents presented in the next section: These do not support the predicted XY universality of the boundary line where the $A - P$ transition is supposed to occur.

Additional structure found by NB in the region of the multicritical point where phases A , B , and P meet is beyond the scope of the present technique and thus could not be verified.

IV. FINITE-SIZE SCALING

The analysis of MC generated histograms used here to determine finite-size scaling behavior is now well tested in standard systems²² as well as in frustrated Heisenberg,²³ XY ,¹³ and Ising models.⁹ In particular, new results for the present model at $H = 0$ yielded critical-exponent

estimates⁹ $\beta = 0.341(4)$, $\gamma = 1.31(3)$, $\nu = 0.662(9)$, giving $\alpha = 0.012(30)$ by the Rushbrooke equality. These results agree well with estimates from standard calculations on the unfrustrated XY model, such as from renormalization group analysis:²⁴ $\beta = 0.349(4)$, $\gamma = 1.315(7)$, $\nu = 0.671(5)$ (giving $\alpha = -0.013(15)$). Finite-size scaling at first-order transitions is also now well understood²⁵ and tested in frustrated systems.¹¹ In addition, tricritical behavior has been observed in exponent values for the frustrated XY model.¹³ In an effort to determine the critical behavior of the paramagnetic phase boundary of Fig. 2, finite-size scaling at three points ($H=0.5, 1.0$, and 3.0 as indicated on Fig. 2) was performed using the same quality of MC data as in Ref. 9.

Scaling (of the form $\sim L^x$) was performed at the critical temperature, T_N , estimated by the order-parameter cumulant (U_m) crossing method, as used previously by us for frustrated spin systems.^{9,13,23} A variety of thermodynamic functions were examined, including the specific heat C , order parameter M , susceptibility $\chi \sim \langle M^2 \rangle$, energy cumulant $U(T) = 1 - \frac{1}{3} \langle E^4 \rangle / \langle E^2 \rangle^2$, and the logarithmic derivative of M , which is equivalent to $V_1(T) = \langle ME \rangle / \langle M \rangle - \langle E \rangle$, as well as the second logarithmic derivative of M , $V_2(T) = \langle M^2 E \rangle / \langle M^2 \rangle - \langle E \rangle$. MC runs were made on lattices $L = 12 - 30$, with averaging performed using 5×10^5 MC steps for the smaller lattices, and up to 2×10^6 MC steps for the larger lattices, after discarding the initial $1 - 5 \times 10^5$ MC steps for thermalization. Additional averaging was then made using the results from between 6 (smaller lattices) to 12 separate runs. This yields a reasonable 2.4×10^7 MC steps used for averaging at the largest lattice size. Gross estimates of error bars, given as an indication of the general quality of the data, were made by taking the standard deviation of results from these runs.

A. Scaling at $H=0.5$

Results of the histogram analysis performed at $H = 0.5$ and $T = 2.99$, (near the paramagnetic phase boundary) are presented here. Fig. 3 shows data at which $U_m(T)$ for $L = 12$ and 15 cross corresponding results at larger values of L' , giving an estimate of the critical temperature $T_N = 2.987(5)$. (This value compares with the result at zero field, $T_N = 2.9298(10)$.⁹) Finite-size scaling of other thermodynamic functions was performed at T_N , as well as at $T = 2.982$ and $T = 2.992$, thus providing a method with which to estimate errors associated with critical exponents.²⁶ The extrapolated value of the energy cumulant, $U^* = 0.66664(3)$, shown in Fig. 4a, is close to the result $2/3$ expected at a continuous transition. Scaling of the other thermodynamic functions is shown in Figs. 4b-e.

Critical exponent-ratios associated with these functions were estimated using all the data, as well as with results at $L = 12$ and $L = 15$ excluded.²⁶ Except for

the specific heat, only a small effect was observed in the estimated values. By this method, α/ν was found to be 0.85(4), 0.79(7), and 0.68(11), respectively, where quoted errors represent only the robustness of the fits. In contrast, the same exercise yields 0.465(5), 0.455(4), and 0.451(5) for β/ν . Results given on the figures are from fits made with only the $L = 12$ data excluded. (Our conclusions are not affected by which set of data is used in the estimates.) The value $1/\nu = 1.947(5)$ was also determined from the data for V_2 (not shown). Our final results at $H = 0.5$ are $\alpha = 0.40(13)$, $\beta = 0.23(5)$, $\gamma = 1.09(12)$, and (taking the average of the two estimates for ν) $\nu = 0.51(3)$, where errors take account of uncertainties in T_N . These values are not close to the expected XY universality of an $A - P$ transition (as found at $H = 0$). They are suggestive, however, of tricritical behavior, where $\alpha = 1/2$, $\beta = 1/4$, $\gamma = 1$, and $\nu = 1/2$,

B. Scaling at $H=1.0$

Corresponding results at $H = 1.0$ (based on histograms generated at $T = 3.07$ for $L = 12 - 27$ and $T = 3.068$ for $L = 30$) are presented in Figs. 5 and 6. The critical temperature was estimated in this case to be $T_N = 3.067(2)$. Although the cumulant-crossing data for $L=15$ appears to be more widely scattered in Fig. 5 than in Fig. 3, note the difference in temperature scales by approximately a factor of two. The possibility that this transition is close to being first order is evidenced by the extrapolated result $U^* = 0.66656(8)$, which is slightly less than $2/3$ even within error. (As with all MC data, however, caution must be taken in assessing the reliability of error estimates.) Following the method outlined above, critical exponents at this transition were estimated to be $\alpha = 0.59(14)$, $\beta = 0.22(3)$, $\gamma = 0.97(8)$, and $\nu = 0.46(2)$ (with the result $1/\nu = 2.17(2)$ from V_2 included). Again, these results are not those expected of XY universality, but (with the possible exception of ν) are consistent with tricritical behavior.

C. Scaling at $H=3.0$

At the relatively high field value of $H = 3$, a first-order transition from the paramagnetic to 3-state Potts phase B is expected. Significant scatter in the cumulant-crossing data of Fig. 7 is observed (from histograms generated at $T = 3.14$ for $L = 12 - 27$ and $T = 3.137$ for $L = 30$), but again note the increased sensitivity of the temperature scale (a factor of three greater than that of Fig. 5). The transition temperature is estimated to be $T_N = 3.1365(10)$, with an error notably smaller than at the other two field values.

Based on our previous experience with weak first-order transitions in frustrated spin systems, some care must be taken in the analysis and interpretation of the data in the

present case.¹¹ In particular, finite-size effects appear to be especially important so that only results at the larger lattice sizes may display the true critical behavior.²⁷ This is evident in the data shown for the energy cumulant, specific heat, and susceptibility (χ) of Figs. 8a-c where volume-dependent scaling is observed only at larger L . Corresponding results for the susceptibility defined by $\chi' \sim \langle M^2 \rangle - \langle M \rangle^2$ (considered to be less useful at a continuous transition than χ as defined above²²), as well as V_1 and V_2 , however, display volume dependence even at the smaller lattices, as seen in Figs. 8d-e. These behaviors, along with the extrapolated value $U^* = 0.66484(15)$ (considerably less than $2/3$), are convincing indicators that the transition is indeed first order and involves the B phase.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Although general features of the phase diagram associated with the ferromagnetically stacked triangular Ising antiferromagnet determined here by extensive MC simulations are in agreement with the Mean-Field Monte Carlo results of Netz and Berker, some significant differences are evident. In addition to finding only the partially ordered phase A stable at zero field, the results suggest that this phase is destabilized by any finite field. This suggestion is based primarily on finite-size scaling results at the supposed $A - P$ transition where the expected XY universality, found at $H = 0$, is not observed in the critical exponents. The results are, however, possibly consistent with this boundary in the phase diagram being a line of tricritical points at which phases A , B and P are degenerate. We consider the possibility of non-universal critical behavior (as a function of field) unlikely as this phenomenon, as far as we know, has not previously been observed in a three dimensional system.

We find good evidence from finite-size scaling that the higher-field transition to the 3-state Potts phase B is indeed first order. This result is fully consistent with NB and is also observed in the corresponding XY model.¹¹ Somewhat surprising was the degree to which finite-size effects are important at this transition. For this reason, our original intention of studying this model with the addition of site disorder in an effort to observe a continuous 3-state Potts transition,²⁸ has been abandoned in favor of studying the same effect in the corresponding XY model.¹¹ It is hoped that the present work will serve to stimulate further theoretical effort as well as inspire a search for suitable experimentally testable realizations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank A.N. Berker for useful discussions. This work was supported by NSERC of Canada and FCAR du Québec.

-
- ¹ G.H. Wannier, Phys. Rev. **79**, 357 (1950).
- ² S.N. Coppersmith, Phys. Rev. B **32**, 1584 (1985).
- ³ *Magnetic Systems with Competing Interactions*, edited by H.T. Diep (World Scientific, Singapore, 1994).
- ⁴ R.R. Netz, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 16113 (1993); O. Nagai, M. Kang, T. Horiguchi, and H.T. Diep, Phys. Lett. A **186**, 359 (1994); T. Garel, V. Ilakovac, and S. Ravy, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 12791 (1994).
- ⁵ A.N. Berker *et al.*, J. Appl. Phys. **55**, 2416 (1984); D. Blankschtein *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **29**, 5250 (1984).
- ⁶ O. Heinonen and R.G. Petschek, Phys. Rev. B **40**, 9052 (1989).
- ⁷ M.L. Plumer *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 14312 (1993).
- ⁸ A. Bunker, B.D. Gaulin, and C. Kallin, Phys. Rev. B **48** (1993).
- ⁹ M.L. Plumer and A. Mailhot, Phys. Rev. E (submitted).
- ¹⁰ M.L. Plumer and A. Caillé, J. Appl. Phys. **69**, 6161 (1991).
- ¹¹ M.L. Plumer, A. Mailhot, and A. Caillé, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 3840 (1993); *ibid* **49**, 15133 (1994).
- ¹² R.R. Netz and A.N. Berker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 377 (1991); J. Appl. Phys. **70**, 6074 (1991); J.R. Banavar, M. Cieplak, and A. Maritan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 1807 (1991); R.R. Netz and A.N. Berker, *ibid* 1808; A. Kabakoglu, A.N. Berker, and M.C. Yalabik, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 2680 (1994).
- ¹³ M.L. Plumer and A. Mailhot, Phys. Rev. B, Dec. 1 (1994).
- ¹⁴ M. Mekata, J. Phys. Soc. Japan **42**, 76 (1977); H. Shiba, Prog. Theor. Phys. **64**, 466 (1980); T. Kurata and H. Kawamura (unpublished).
- ¹⁵ S. Fujiki, K. Shutoh, and S. Katsura, J. Phys. Soc. Japan Suppl. **52**, 195 (1983); F. Matsubara and S. Inawashiro, J. Phys. Soc. Japan **56**, 2666 (1987); J.-J. Kim, Y. Yamda, and O. Nagai, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 4760 (1990).
- ¹⁶ M.L. Plumer, A. Caillé, and K. Hood, Phys. Rev. B **40**, 4958 (1989); M.L. Plumer and A. Caillé, J. Appl. Phys. **70**, 5961 (1991).
- ¹⁷ A. Farkas, B.D. Gaulin, Z. Tun, and B. Briat, J. Appl. Phys. **69**, 6167 (1991).
- ¹⁸ M. Kaburagi, T. Tonegawa, and J. Kanamori, J. Phys. Soc. Japan **51**, 3857 (1982).
- ¹⁹ A.M. Ferrenberg and R.H. Swendsen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 2635 (1988); *ibid* **63**, 1195 (1989); Computers in Physics, Sept/Oct, 101 (1989).
- ²⁰ M.L. Plumer, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 12376 (1991).
- ²¹ In practice, ϕ was determined by $\tan^{-1}(\tau/\sigma)$, where $\sigma = X \cos \phi$ and $\tau = X \sin \phi$, following D.H. Lee, J.D. Joannopoulos, J.W. Negele, and D.P. Landau, Phys. Rev. B **33**, 450 (1986).
- ²² P. Peczak, A.M. Ferrenberg, and D.P. Landau, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 6087 (1991); A.M. Ferrenberg and D.P. Landau, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 5081 (1991); C. Holm and W. Janke, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 936 (1993); K. Chen, A.M. Ferrenberg, and D.P. Landau, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 3249 (1993).
- ²³ A. Mailhot, M.L. Plumer, and A. Caillé, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 6854 (1994).
- ²⁴ J.C. Le Guillou and J. Zinn-Justin, J. Phys. Lett. (Paris) **46**, L137 (1985).
- ²⁵ P. Peczak and D.P. Landau, Phys. Rev. B **39**, 11932 (1989); J. Lee and J.M. Kosterlitz, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 3265 (1991); K. Binder *et al.*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. C **3**, 1025 (1992); K. Vollmayr, J.D. Reger, M. Scheucher, and K. Binder, Z. Phys. B **91**, 113 (1993); A. Billoire, T. Neuhaus, and B. Berg, Nucl. Phys. B **396**, 779 (1993); W. Janke, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 14757 (1993).
- ²⁶ See, e.g., A.P. Gottlob and M. Hasenbusch, Physica A, **201**, 593 (1993); *ibid*, to be published.
- ²⁷ J.N. Reimers, J.E. Greedan, and M. Björgvinsson, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 7295 (1992); A. Mailhot and M.L. Plumer, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 9881 (1993).
- ²⁸ A.N. Berker, J. Appl. Phys. **70**, 5941 (1991); R. Fisch, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 11310 (1992).

FIG. 1. Phase diagram from molecular-field theory. Regions labelled *P* and *B* represent paramagnetic and 3-state Potts phases, respectively. Broken line is a first-order phase boundary.

FIG. 2. Possible phase diagram from Monte Carlo simulations, labelled as in Fig. 1, with the additional phase *A* representing the partially disordered state. Question mark indicates our uncertainty regarding the extent to which phase *A* exists in the phase diagram. Circles at $H=0.5$, 1.0, and 3.0 represent field values at which finite-size scaling was performed. Squares denote possible locations of multicritical points. Broken and solid lines represent first-order and continuous phase boundaries, respectively.

FIG. 3. Results of applying the cumulant-crossing method to estimate the critical temperature at $H = 0.5$, where $b=L'/L$.

FIG. 4. Finite-size scaling at the paramagnetic transition for $H = 0.5$ at $T_N = 2.987$ where fitting is performed with the smallest lattice ($L=12$) omitted. Errors represent the robustness of the fit, except in the case of the energy cumulant (a), where it is determined by the uncertainty in T_N . The specific heat, order parameter, susceptibility, and logarithmic derivative of the order parameter are shown in (b)-(e), respectively.

FIG. 5. Results of applying the cumulant-crossing method to estimate the critical temperature at $H = 1.0$.

FIG. 6. Finite-size scaling at the paramagnetic transition for $H = 1.0$ at $T_N = 3.067$, as in Fig. 4.

FIG. 7. Results of applying the cumulant-crossing method to estimate the critical temperature at $H = 3.0$.

FIG. 8. Finite-size scaling at the paramagnetic transition for $H = 3.0$ at $T_N = 3.1365$ with the assumption of volume dependence.